CrossMark

simile's potential for pathos and humanization.[16] It may be, further, that the toppling of a tree-like rock rather than of an actual tree also enables Hercules to retain his credentials as a tree-hugger, not a tree-cutter.[17] Naturally, it remains open for readers to decide whether they feel any more comfortable about overweening violence brought against rocks which seem a bit like trees than they do about violence towards actual trees,[18] but a straightforward episode of tree violation is at least avoided.[19] At any rate, with the close of this episode, suggestive rock-woods and rock-tree give way to the understated but actual *lucus* in which the Ara Maxima is established (*Aen.* 8.271–2), and Evander wreathes his brows with Hercules' own white poplar leaves, marking both the hero-god's triumph and the reinstatement of trees and woods as dominant features of the landscape now free of the fire-breathing, rock-dwelling monster.

St Hilda's College, Oxford REBECCA ARMSTRONG
rebecca.armstrong@st-hildas.ox.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0009838820000786

AN ACROSTIC IN *AENEID* 11.902–6*

Very shortly before the end of Book 11 of the *Aeneid*, Turnus, hearing of Camilla's death, is forced to abandon his ambush in order to fall back to the city. Just after he leaves the wooded gorge, Aeneas passes through it unscathed with his company.

[16] In contrast with the death of the Minotaur, whose fall like that of a great tree (Catull. 64.105–9) evokes sympathy. Apollonius' Talos may provide a still closer connection here in a combination of monstrosity, rocks and trees: the giant bronze man keeps his enemies away in classic giant style by casting boulders, but, brought low by Medea's evil eye, he falls like a great pine tree, uprooted and making an enormous crash (*Argon.* 4.1677–88).

[17] On an intriguing painting of Hercules actually hugging a tree, see A. Hunt, *Reviving Roman Religion. Sacred Trees in the Roman World* (Cambridge, 2016), 224–6. Nevertheless, as the anonymous reviewer rightly observes, in his choice of weapons to use against Cacus, Hercules combines both rocks and trees: *ramis uastisque molaribus instat* ('he attacks with branches and great mill-stones', *Aen.* 8.250). Here a Virgilian stone-based hapax legomenon alludes to a Homeric hapax legomenon (*molaris* = μύλαξ, *Il.* 12.161), which may subtly emphasize the priority of rocks in this moment even while undeniably drawing in tree branches too. On the hapax legomenon, see J. Wills, 'Homeric and Virgilian doublets: the case of *Aeneid* 6.901', *MD* 38 (1997), 185–202, at 194–5. On the broader ambiguities of the presentation of Hercules in the *Aeneid*, a helpful summary (together with particular interpretation) is offered by L. Morgan, 'Assimilation and civil war: Hercules and Cacus, *Aeneid* 8', in H.P. Stahl (ed.), *Vergil's* Aeneid*: Augustan Epic and Political Context* (Swansea, 1998), 175–98.

[18] Intuitively, perhaps rocks seem less obvious candidates for sympathy than trees, and the frequent connection in the *Aeneid* between rocks, mountains and the monstrous may add to this sense (cf. Hardie [n. 7], 100–3, 264–5). Nevertheless, one might find at least some pathos in moments of lapidary anthropomorphism, as when the anxious Latinus is like a wave-battered rock (*Aen.* 7.586–90, parallel to the Aeneas-as-storm-battered-tree simile of *Aen.* 4.441–6), or the man-mountain Atlas at *Aen.* 4.246–51, as well as the fall of Bitias (see n. 7).

[19] Contrast, notoriously, Aeneas' removal of Faunus' sacred oleaster at *Aen.* 12.766–73: see R.F. Thomas, 'Tree violation and ambivalence in Vergil', *TAPhA* 118 (1988), 261–73.

* I am grateful to the editor and to the anonymous reviewer of *CQ* for their comments on this note.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000750 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Both then head toward the city walls. Virgil marks this near miss of the two commanders by an acrostic (*Aen*. 11.901–7):[1]

> ille furens (et saeua Iouis sic numina pellunt)
> **d**eserit obsessos collis, nemora aspera linquit.
> **u**ix e conspectu exierat campumque tenebat,
> **c**um pater Aeneas saltus ingressus apertos
> **e**xsuperatque iugum siluaque euadit opaca.
> **s**ic ambo ad muros rapidi totoque feruntur
> agmine nec longis inter se passibus absunt.

The first letters of verses 11.902–6 spell out *duces*, a word whose thematic importance for the *Aeneid* can hardly be understated.[2] As far as I can see, this acrostic has not been given scholarly treatment since it was first relegated by Isidore Hilberg to his massive dossier of what he deemed to be accidental acrostics.[3] This would appear, however, to be a very promising candidate for a further deliberate acrostic. The most convincing acrostics are often accompanied by the word in the immediate context.[4] This is not the case here, but the general harmony of the suggested acrostic with the context should be clear.[5] Not only do we find here both Turnus and Aeneas in their capacity as leaders, Virgil has gone out of his way to emphasize them (cf. 901 *ille*; 904 *pater Aeneas*; 906 *ambo*) over their respective armies.[6] One who is not yet satisfied by these observations might object that acrostics have a tendency to occur alongside subtle metapoetic signals that alert the reader to them.[7] Our passage is not lacking in these. The phrase *e conspectu* (903) may already be a warning that there is something that escapes the eye; or, if we take *uix e conspectu* together, it is thereby indicated that there is something 'hardly out of sight', emphasizing the fact that the acrostic lies just under our noses. I tentatively suggest that another such hint is provided by the reference to *silua … opaca* (905). Words roughly synonymous with *opaca*, such as *latebrosus*, have been noticed elsewhere as markers of cryptic messages in the text.[8] And when we consider

[1] The Latin text is M. Geymonat (ed.), *P. Vergili Maronis opera* (Rome, 2008[2]).

[2] We need only recall the self-epitaph traditionally attributed to Virgil (*VSD* 36): *Mantua me genuit; Calabri rapuere; tenet nunc | Parthenope. cecini pascua, rura, duces*.

[3] I. Hilberg, 'Ist die Ilias Latina von einem Italicus verfasst oder einem Italicus gewidmet?', *WS* 21 (1899), 264–305, at 298. The acrostic is not mentioned in e.g. J.T. Katz, 'The Muse at play: an introduction', in J. Kwapisz, D. Petrain and M. Szymański (edd.), *The Muse at Play. Riddles and Wordplay in Greek and Latin Poetry* (Berlin, 2013), 1–30, M. Robinson, 'Looking edgeways. Pursuing acrostics in Ovid and Virgil', *CQ* 69 (2019), 290–308, or M. Robinson, 'Arms and a mouse: approaching acrostics in Ovid and Vergil', *MD* 82 (2019), 23–73.

[4] I have in mind especially Aratus' famous **ΛΕΠΤΗ** gamma-acrostic (*Phaen.* 783–7), where the word appears both vertically and horizontally: see J.-M. Jacques, 'Sur un acrostiche d'Aratos (*Phén*., 783–787)', *REA* 62 (1960), 48–61. In Virgil, there is the well-known **MARS** acrostic in *Aen*. 7.601–4, where 7.603 includes the word *Martem*: see D.P. Fowler, 'An acrostic in Vergil (*Aeneid* 7. 601–4)?', *CQ* 33 (1983), 298. But see also A.A. Grishin, '*Ludus in undis*: an acrostic in *Eclogue* 9', *HSPh* 104 (2008), 237–40, for the **VNDIS** acrostic in *Ecl*. 9.34–8; verse 39 has the question *quis est nam ludus in undis?*, thus confirming the acrostic.

[5] For a case of a Virgilian acrostic which corresponds not to a specific word but, none the less, to the theme of a passage, see e.g. J. Danielewicz, 'Further Hellenistic acrostics: Aratus and others', *Mnemosyne* 58 (2005), 321–34, at 324. The acrostic is **INANIS** (*Ecl.* 8.42–7), and it answers the remark *nunc scio, quid sit amor* (8.43).

[6] Note that the grammatical subjects of the clauses are Turnus, Aeneas, or both. The armies are only explicitly mentioned in the ablatival phrase *totoque … agmine* (906–7).

[7] Cf. e.g. D. Feeney and D. Nelis, 'Two Virgilian acrostics: *certissima signa*?', *CQ* 55 (2005), 644–6, where such signalling is discussed.

[8] Cf. M.A.S. Carter, '*Vergilium vestigare*: *Aeneid* 12.587–8', *CQ* 52 (2002), 615–17, at 616.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000750 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the metaliterary force of *silua* as referring to poetic material,[9] the signalling of something hidden in these verses becomes only more apparent. Furthermore, can it really be mere coincidence that Turnus should forsake his hiding place at precisely the point (902) where Virgil prepares his own? To sum up on a more general note, it is difficult to imagine a better place to have a concealed *duces* acrostic than in a passage which thematizes one leader waiting in ambush for another and then in turn only just failing to see him.

The University of Chicago PAUL K. HOSLE
phosle@uchicago.edu
doi:10.1017/S0009838820000750

ENCORE LA FEMME: OVID, *ARS AMATORIA* 3.27–30[1]

nil nisi lasciui per me discuntur amores:
  femina praecipiam quo sit amanda modo.
femina nec flammas nec saeuos discutit arcus;
  parcius haec uideo tela nocere uiris.

It was pointed out in 1992 by E.J. Kenney that *femina* in line 28 'sabotages the poet's … disclaimer' that it is not women generally but 'only those not ruled out of bounds by *stola* and *uittae*' who are to benefit from his instruction.[2] He suggests instead that, since what is wanted is a variation on the previous line, one should read *nec proba*, or, as a better possibility, *non proba*. Kenney's objection to *femina* is accepted by Roland Mayer, in a note published the following year.[3] After observing, however, that, 'when a word has intruded itself from a nearby line and expelled the authentic reading, the *ductus litterarum* is no guide to emendation', and that bold measures are therefore admissible, Mayer proposes *Thais*, comparing *Rem. am.* 385–6 *Thais in arte mea est: lasciuia libera nostra est; | nil mihi cum uitta; Thais in arte mea est*. Later, W.S. Watt suggested *talis*, viz. *lasciua*, noting *talis* at 142 and *talem* at 157.[4] None of these suggestions is entirely compelling, however, and Gibson is therefore right just to obelize *femina* in his edition;[5] but he also points out in the commentary ad loc. the 'greater oddity' relating to *amanda*, asking 'Should Ovid not be declaring his intention to teach women how to love, rather than declaring that he will teach

[9] See especially S. Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (Cambridge, 1998), 11–14, on *Aeneid* Book 6, A.M. Keith, 'Slender verse: Roman elegy and ancient rhetorical theory', *Mnemosyne* 52 (1999), 41–62, at 48, on Horace, and D. Petrain, 'Hylas and Silva: etymological wordplay in Propertius 1.20', *HSPh* 100 (2000), 409–21, on Propertius. It is true that *silua* more properly has the metaliterary sense of poetic source material, but its looser, more general use is also attested: Keith (this note), 48.

[1] I am grateful to the anonymous *CQ* reader of this note for several suggestions.
[2] E.J. Kenney, 'Chassez la femme', *CQ* 42 (1992), 551–2.
[3] R. Mayer, 'La femme retrouvée', *CQ* 43 (1993), 504.
[4] W.S. Watt, 'Notes on Latin poetry: Ovid, Lucan, Silius Italicus, Statius, Martial, Rutilius, and fragmentary Latin poets', *BICS* 42 (1997–8), 145–58, at 147.
[5] R.K. Gibson (ed.), *Ovid Ars Amatoria Book 3* (Cambridge, 2003).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000750 Published online by Cambridge University Press